

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-10 are now present in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosure (FIG. 1), in view of McCartney, U.S. Patent No. 5,831,693. Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosure (FIG. 1) in view of McCartney, and further in view of Ma, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0019381. Claims 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosure (FIG. 1) in view of McCartney, and further in view of Umemoto, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0030724. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements including "a first anti-reflection coating formed on the lower transparent substrate and adjacent to the translucent reflecting layer" and "the first anti-reflection coating reduces a reflecting rate of an inner light emitting from the backlight module that is reflected by the translucent reflecting layer, and increases a transmission rate of the inner light passing through the translucent reflecting layer, thereby improving a luminance of the liquid crystal display." Applicant respectfully submits that the above

combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Applicant's Disclosure in FIG. 1 fails to disclose a first anti-reflection coating. However, the Examiner turned to rely on McCartney's teaching of the light shield (chromium) 35 and alleged that the light shield (chromium) 35 is the first anti-reflection coating. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

McCartney discloses a liquid crystal display panel that can self-adjust the display luminance of an active matrix liquid crystal display panel according to the ambient lighting. McCartney further discloses that a light shield (chromium) 35 is deposited on a lower glass substrate 29 to prevent the backlight from impinging on the photodiode 12, as shown in figures 3A-3C (see also col. 3 lines 61-65.) Since chromium is a reflective material, the light shield (chromium) 35 is used to reflect the backlight to prevent it from impinging on the light sensitive TFT channel region. Since chromium is reflective and commonly used for its reflection characteristics, it cannot serve as anti-reflection coating by definition. Therefore, McCartney's light shield (chromium) 35 cannot be construed as "a first anti-reflection coating formed on the lower transparent substrate and adjacent to the translucent reflecting layer" and cannot teach "the first anti-reflection coating reduces a reflecting rate of an inner light emitting from the backlight module that is reflected by the translucent reflecting layer, and increases a transmission rate of the inner light passing through the translucent reflecting layer, thereby improving a luminance of the liquid crystal display" as recited in claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Ma and Umemoto, these references have only been relied on for its teachings related to the subject matter of some dependent claims. These

references also fail to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, this reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Applicant's Disclosure in FIG. 1 and McCartney.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Murcy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

